

THE OCHNACEOUS GENUS *CAPUSIA* H. LECOMTE (1926)
A SYNONYM OF THE CELASTRACEOUS
SIPHONODON GRIFFITH (1844)

E. D. MERRILL

TWO SPECIMENS of *Poilane 10805*, cited in the original description of *Capusia annamensis* H. Lecomte, recently received at the Arnold Arboretum, directed my attention to the status of Lecomte's recently proposed new genus, for the reason that, at sight, I had assigned the sheets to the Celastraceae without first looking up the group in which Lecomte placed his supposed new genus. A more critical examination of the material, supplemented by an examination of Lecomte's detailed description and excellent illustrations, at once indicated that his supposed new ochraceous genus *Capusia* was actually the same as *Siphonodon* Griffith, a somewhat anomalous genus of the Celastraceae. While the generic identity of the two entities is unmistakable, the species apparently represents a form distinct from the widely distributed *Siphonodon celastrineus* Griff., and in reducing *Capusia* to *Siphonodon*, the following new combination is made:

Siphonodon annamensis (H. Lecomte), comb. nov.

Capusia annamensis H. Lecomte, Bull. Mus. Hist. Nat. [Paris] 23: 96. f. 1-2. 1926.

Lecomte's Indo-Chinese species was based on a series of specimens collected by Poilane, of which I have seen two sheets of *Poilane 10805*. It is closely allied to the widely distributed Indo-Malaysian *Siphonodon celastrineus* Griff., yet it seems to be distinct in its constantly 1-flowered inflorescences and in the somewhat accrescent calyx tubes that persist on the young fruits. Griffith's species is characterized by its several- to many-flowered axillary inflorescences. While it is perhaps understandable why Lecomte proposed and described this as a new genus, since *Siphonodon* is somewhat anomalous in the Celastraceae, it is very difficult to understand why he placed *Capusia* in the Ochnaceae. As I interpret its morphological characters, *Capusia* = *Siphonodon*, presents nothing that could be properly interpreted as ochraceous in its floral or fruit structure, nor in its vegetative characters. Again, in view of the fact that Pierre, Fl. Forest. Cochinch. 4: t. 312A. 1891, illustrated and

described *Siphonodon celastrineus* Griff. in detail, and stated that it was very common in lower CochinChina (a statement repeated by Pitard in Lecomte Fl. Gén. Indo-Chine **1**: 907. *t.* 114, 9–11. 1912, who also gave a detailed description and illustration of it) Lecomte's *lapsus* becomes more difficult to understand. He was apparently misled by the gynoe-cium characters, which he misinterpreted, and ignored the obviously celastraceous characters of the other organs. Further illustrations of Griffith's species appear in the latter's original paper, Calcutta Jour. Nat. Hist. **4**: 247. *t.* 14. 1844, in Hooker f. Trans. Linn. Soc. **22**: *t.* 26. 1857, where a detailed morphological study of the genus is given, in Schnizlein, Iconogr. **4**: *t.* 237. 1866–70, and in Koorders, Atlas Baumart. Java **1**: *t.* 140. 1913. Other species of the genus are illustrated by Maiden, For. Fl. N. S. Wales **2**: *t.* 64. 1905, and by F. M. Bailey, Compreh. Cat. Queensl. Pl. 102. 1913; the last cited illustration is very poor.

ARNOLD ARBORETUM,
HARVARD UNIVERSITY.